



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,965	06/12/2006	Arik Avni	AMDL-0050	4941
7590 Michael P Dunnam Woodcock Washburn One Liberty Place 46th Floor Philadelphia, PA 19103			EXAMINER LEE, ERICA SHENGKAI	
			ART UNIT 3766	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 06/08/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/520,965

Applicant(s)

AVNI ET AL.

Examiner

ERICA LEE

Art Unit

3766

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 March 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 and 16-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8-23 and 26-40 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 9-13, 16-22, 24 and 25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to:

03/15/2010 – Applicant response to first action.

09/14/2009 – First non-final action.

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed March 15, 2010 has been entered. Claims 1, 7, 13, 16-18, 21, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34 and 39 have been amended. Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled. Claims 8, 23 and 26-40 were previously withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. Currently, claims 1-7, 9-13, 16-22, 24 and 25 are pending for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed March 15, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

3. With respect to Applicant's response to the restriction requirement affirming the election of Invention I (claims 1-33) and species A1 (claims 18-25, figures 2A-C), species B1 (claim 7, figures 2A-B), and species C1 (claim 22) on pages 11-12, Applicant also states disagreeing with the restriction requirement as issued in error, and reserving the right to challenge the restriction. However, Applicant has provided no arguments traversing this restriction requirement. Furthermore, in the non-final Office Action dated September 14, 2009, item 10 states Michael Dunnam elected the above

inventions **without traverse**. Therefore, the election of claims in response to the restriction requirement is treated as being without traverse.

4. With respect to Applicant's remarks on page 13 directed to claims 1-18, Applicant has amended claim 1 to require an attached control unit of one of a weight bearing biofeedback system and an electrical stimulation system. Havriluk (US Pat 5,005,140) discloses electrical output signals (col. 3, lines 35-36 and lines 55-60) from the pressure sensors ("transducers 201, 202") which are representative of the weight bearing on the location, and wherein the electrical output signals are provided as input signals to an attached control unit ("computer 101"; fig. 1) of one of a weight-bearing biofeedback system ("exercise peak force, average force" col. 5, lines 28-44). Furthermore, Applicant has provided in the instant specification in paragraph [0049] that weight-bearing biofeedback can be provided from a PC display etc. which Examiner believes Havriluk discloses.

5. Applicant has amended claim 18 to require a stimulator that delivers stimulation to a foot in response to said electrical output signals, a limitation provided in claim 21 which was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) with Havriluk in view of Goldman (US Pat 5,775,332). Examiner asserts that this rejection is still valid. Havriluk discloses determining exercise peak force, average force among others (col. 5, lines 28-44), which Examiner asserts is representative of the weight bearing on the respective inflatable pockets, since the electrical output signals from the pressure sensors (transducers 201, 202) are representative of the at least two inflatable pockets and are used to generate these exercise peak force and average force values.

6. Applicant's arguments on page 14, directed to claims 1-3 and 11 as well as claim 12, Examiner asserts Hochberg (US Pat 4,989,615) discloses claimed invention. Hochberg discloses that the pressure sensors are connected to one pressurizing device and one monitor (col. 4, lines 10-12) and that the output of pressure monitor 18 is an electrical signal which is applied to fetal monitor 19 which may include a pressure display indicative of weight bearing (col. 3, lines 10-21).
7. Applicant's arguments on page 14 directed to claims 4, 5 and 9 and page 15 directed to claim 6 are not persuasive since Examiner asserts Havriluk discloses the claimed invention.
8. Applicant's arguments on page 15 directed to claims 15, 17, 21 and 22 are not persuasive since Examiner asserts Havriluk discloses the claimed invention.
9. Applicant's arguments on page 16 directed to claims 24 and 25 are not persuasive since Examiner asserts Havriluk discloses the claimed invention.
10. Applicant's arguments, see page 14, filed March 15, 2010, with respect to claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Havriluk in view of Hochberg have been fully considered and are persuasive. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claim 19 has been withdrawn.
11. The 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph rejection of claim 17 has been withdrawn.
12. The objection to the provided oath or declaration is withdrawn.

13. The amendment to the drawings (figure 1) filed March 15, 2010 has been entered. The objection to the drawings (figure 1) is withdrawn.

14. Though previously indicated as allowable, upon further consideration, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Havriluk in view of Rechin et al. (US Pat 6,145,142).

Priority

15. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for priority based on an international application PCT/IL03/000572 filed on July 10, 2003. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the international application as required by 37 CFR 1.495(b) because the international application has not yet been received from the International Bureau (IB).

16. Receipt of papers is acknowledged for applicant's claim for priority based on a provisional application 60/395,127 filed on July 11, 2002.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

17. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

18. Claims 16, 18-22 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

19. Claim 18 recites "a stimulator that delivers stimulation to a foot". Nowhere in the instant application does it state a stimulator that delivers stimulation to a foot. In fact, paragraph [0036] states that it is the posterior muscles of the tibia that are stimulated.

20. Similarly, claim 16 recites "weight bearing biofeedback system generates feedback to the location in response to the input signals. If Applicant intends for the biofeedback system to generate feedback specifically to the location of the pockets, Applicant does not have support in the specification of the instant application for feedback to the foot, knee or palm.

21. Claims 19-22 and 24-25 are rejected for being dependent on claim 18.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 1, 3 10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk (US Pat 5,005,140; previously cited).

24. Regarding claim 1, Havriluk discloses a force sensor system for monitoring weight bearing at a location on a person comprising a plurality of

independent, non-overlapping pockets inflated with air 410, 412, 414, 416 (fig. 8), said pockets forming the interior of at least one flexible pouch placed at or near the location (fig. 8); a plurality of tubes, wherein at least one tube allows flow of air in and out of each of the pockets to a location remote from the pouch 426, 428, 430, 432 (fig. 8); and a plurality of pressure sensors remote from the pouch connected to said pockets through said tubes, wherein each pressure sensor is disposed to detect the pressure applied to at least one pocket (col. 6, lines 5-29). Havriluk also discloses each pressure sensor ("transducers 201, 202" col. 6, line 11) converts received pressure signals to electrical output signals (col. 3, lines 35-36 and lines 55-60), and wherein the electrical output signals are provided as input signals to an attached control unit ("computer 101"; fig. 1) of one of a weight-bearing biofeedback system ("exercise peak force, average force" col. 5, lines 28-44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the electrical output signals would be indicative of weight bearing on the location since the device is designed for a patient to place weight on the pockets.

25. Regarding claims 3 and 10, Havriluk discloses the flexible pouch comprises a flexible insole worn inside a shoe (col. 6, lines 13-16), where the flexible insole contains a first inflatable pocket in the heel region and a second inflatable pocket in the forefoot region of the insole 416 and 410 (fig. 8).

26. Regarding claim 16, Havriluk discloses the weight bearing biofeedback system generates feedback to the location in response to the input signals (col. 5, line 67 to col. 6, line 4; col. 6, lines 16-22).
27. Claims 1-3, 11, 12 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochberg (US Pat 4,989,615; previously cited).
28. Regarding claim 1, Hochberg discloses a force sensor system capable for use in monitoring weight bearing at a location on a person, comprising a plurality of independent, non-overlapping pockets inflated with air, the pockets forming the interior of at least one flexible pouch placed at or near the location 30 (fig. 4); a plurality of tubes, where at least one tube allows flow of air in and out of each of the pockets to a location remote from the pouch (fig. 4); a plurality of pressure sensors remote from the pouch connected to the pockets through the tubes, where each pressure sensor is disposed to detect the pressure applied to at least one pocket (col. 4, lines 6-9). In another embodiment (fig. 3), Hochberg discloses that the pressure sensors are connected to one pressurizing device and one monitor (col. 4, lines 10-12) and that the output of pressure monitor 18 is an electrical signal which is applied to fetal monitor 19 which may include a pressure display indicative of weight bearing (col. 3, lines 10-21). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hochberg so that a biofeedback system indicative of some type of weight bearing were provided for the patient since pressure sensors are already

disposed to detect the pressure applied to at least one pocket and providing this feedback would be beneficial and educational for the patient.

29. Regarding claim 2, Hochberg discloses the system further comprises a plurality of valves remote from the pockets connected to the pockets through the tubes, the valves open to allow inflation and deflation of the pockets and closing to allow closed system operation of the pockets 34 (fig. 4; col. 4, lines 6-12).

30. Regarding claims 3 and 11, Hochburg discloses the flexible pouch comprises a flexible wrap capable of being worn around a knee or a palm (fig. 4); when worn around a knee, the flexible wrap comprises two adhesive strips capable for tightly securing the wrap on the anterior aspect of the knee joint (col. 3, lines 22-28).

31. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hochburg. Hochburg discloses a flexible wrap capable of being worn around a palm comprising two straps 32 (fig. 4) but does not expressly disclose a latch for tightly securing the wrap around the thenar and the hypothenar. However, it is well known in the art to use a latch, such as a belt buckle, in conjunction with two straps, for tightly securing a wrap around a body part. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Hochburg to include the latch to provide a secure attachment of the flexible wrap around the thenar and the hypothenar.

32. Regarding claim 16, Havriluk discloses the weight bearing biofeedback system generates feedback to the location in response to the input signals (col. 5, line 67 to col. 6, line 4; col. 6, lines 16-22)
33. Claims 4, 5, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Toms (US Pat 6,036,660; previously cited).
34. Havriluk discloses claimed invention but does not disclose the flexible pouch comprises two outer layers of fabric sheets, the outer layers of sheets being welded together in a welding pattern using a sealing agent; where the said sealing agent comprises an RF-weld, and the outer layers of fabric sheets comprise a fabric base and a polyurethane coating. Toms teaches a flexible pouch comprising two outer layers of fabric sheets comprising a fabric base and a polyurethane coating, the outer layers of sheets being welded together in a welding patterning using an RF-weld sealing agent 5 (fig. 2; col. 4, lines 33-41). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the two outer layers of fabric sheets comprised of a fabric base and a polyurethane coating, as well as welding together the fabric sheets using an RF-weld sealing agent as taught by Toms in order to provide a more air tight structure and resistance to deformation from air pressures (col. 4, lines 34-38).
35. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Toms and in further view of McEwen et al. (US PG Pub 2003/0036771 A1;

previously cited). Havriluk in view of Toms discloses claimed invention except for the outer layers of fabric sheets comprise a fabric base and a polyvinylchloride coating. McEwen et al. discloses a gas filled bladder formed from polyester fabric with a polyvinylchloride coating ([0050], lines 10-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the polyvinylchloride coated fabric as taught by McEwen et al. in order to provide a flexible gas impermeable bladder layer.

36. Claims 1 and 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Goldman (US Pat 5,775,332; previously cited).

37. Regarding claim 1, Havriluk discloses the electrical output signals are input signals to a device (col. 5, lines 28-44), but does not expressly disclose the electrical output signals are input signals to an attached control unit of an electrical stimulation system. Goldman teaches a weight sensing device with an associated electronic module that provides electrical stimulation (col. 12, lines 19-33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the electrical stimulation system as taught by Goldman in order to provide feedback to the patient about the amount of weight bearing occurring, and to help the patient maintain safe weight bearing (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 8).

38. Regarding claim 17, Havriluk discloses the input signals identify specific stages of a gait cycle of the foot (col. 7, lines 16-21) but does not expressly

disclose the electrical stimulation system uses the input signals to activate an electronic orthosis. Goldman teaches it is well known in the art to associate an electronic orthosis with a force sensor system, and to use electronic cues from the sensor system to activate the electronic orthosis (col. 8, lines 20-28). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include an electronic orthosis as taught by Goldman in order to provide better ambulation in patients (col. 8, lines 27-29).

39. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Rechin et al. (US Pat 6,145,142).

40. Havriluk discloses claimed invention but does not expressly disclose the pockets comprise at least two layers of translucent film. Rechin et al. discloses an inflatable bladder being comprised of a translucent material (claim 23). It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to make the pockets comprising at least two layers of translucent film as taught by Rechin et al., since Applicant has not disclosed that translucent film solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with pockets comprising at least two layers of translucent film.

41. Claims 18 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Goldman.

42. Regarding claims 18 and 21, Havriluk discloses a foot stimulation system capable for use in control of an electronic orthosis comprising a flexible insole worn inside a shoe containing at least two inflatable pockets positioned in the heel region and the forefoot region, respectively, said pockets forming the interior of the flexible insole and being inflated with air 416 and 410 (fig. 8; col. 6, lines 13-16); at least two tubes allowing flow of air in and out of the respective pockets to a location remote from the insole 426-432 (fig. 8); and at least two pressure sensors remote from the insole connected to the respective pockets through the respective tubes; the pressure sensors disposed so as to detect the pressure applied to the inflatable pockets and converting pressure signals to electrical output signals (col. 6, lines 5-29; col. 3, lines 35-36) obviously representative of the weight bearing on the respective inflatable pockets. Havriluk does not disclose a stimulator that delivers stimulation to a foot in response to said electrical output signals and a controller that receives said electrical output signals from said pressure sensors as input signals, said controller activating said stimulator to deliver stimulation to a first muscle group in response to input signals from the heel pressure sensor and activating said stimulator to deliver stimulation to a second muscle group in response to input signals from the forefoot pressure sensor. Havriluk however, teaches two inflatable pockets positioned in the heel region and the forefoot region, for independent force detection of the heel and the forefoot 416 and 410 (fig. 8) and that the specific information sensed from the transducer is converted to electrical signals (col. 4,

lines 16-17; col. 3, lines 35-36) and is sent to a device for processing the signals (col. 5, lines 28-44). Goldman teaches a stimulator that delivers stimulation to a foot (col. 12, lines 19-33) and also teaches stimulation in response to specific types of weight bearing (col. 12, lines 15-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the stimulator as taught by Goldman in order to provide feedback to the patient about the amount of weight bearing occurring, and to help the patient maintain safe weight bearing (col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 8), and furthermore to include a controller for the activation of the stimulator capable of delivering stimulation to different muscle groups in response to different types of weight bearing as taught by Goldman in order to provide detailed feedback to the patient about the type of weight bearing occurring.

43. Regarding claim 20, Havriluk discloses the inflatable pockets include extensions connecting the insole and the tubes 418-424 (fig. 8).

44. Regarding claim 22, Goldman teaches the degree of stimulation to the patient can increase in intensity with weight increase (col. 12, lines 56-58). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the relationship between the stimulation and pressure measurements as taught by Goldman in order to better notify the patient of different degrees of weight bearing.

45. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Goldman and in further view of Hochburg.

46. Havriluk in view of Goldman discloses claimed invention except for at least two valves remote from the insole connected to the inflatable pockets through the tubes, the valves opening to allow inflation and deflation of the inflatable pockets and closing to allow closed system operation of the inflatable pockets. Hochburg teaches a plurality of valves 34 (fig. 4) remote from a wrap and connected to inflatable pockets 30 (fig. 4) through tubes (fig. 4), the valves opening or closing for operation of the inflatable pockets (col. 4, lines 6-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the valves as taught by Hochburg in order to provide more sensitivity control over each of the inflatable pockets.

47. Claims 24 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Goldman and Vredenbregt et al. (US Pat 3,881,496; previously cited).

48. Havriluk in view of Goldman discloses claimed invention except for the first muscle group is the anterior muscles of the tibia, and the second muscle group is the posterior muscles of the tibia. Vredenbregt et al. teaches that electrical stimulation of muscular groups is performed to approach the natural function of the muscles for ambulation (col. 1, lines 44-46). Vredenbregt et al. also teaches stimulating muscles based on weight bearing (abstract, col. 2, lines 3-19). Vredenbregt et al. does not expressly disclose that the stimulated muscular groups are the anterior and posterior

muscles of the tibia in response to input signals from the heel and forefoot pressure sensors, respectively, but it is well known in the art that the anterior and posterior muscles of the tibia function to invert the foot and stabilize the lower leg and ankle during ambulation. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to include the anterior and posterior muscles of the tibia as the stimulated muscle groups in response to input signals from the heel and forefoot pressure sensors, respectively, in order to better facilitate the natural function of the muscle groups for ambulation as taught by Vredenburg et al.

49. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Havriluk in view of Rosenberg (US Pat 4,610,253).

50. Havriluk discloses a foot stimulation system capable for use in control of an electronic orthosis comprising a flexible insole worn inside a shoe containing at least two inflatable pockets positioned in the heel region and the forefoot region, respectively, said pockets forming the interior of the flexible insole and being inflated with air 416 and 410 (fig. 8; col. 6, lines 13-16); at least two tubes allowing flow of air in and out of the respective pockets to a location remote from the insole 426-432 (fig. 8); and at least two pressure sensors remote from the insole connected to the respective pockets through the respective tubes; the pressure sensors disposed so as to detect the pressure applied to the inflatable pockets and converting pressure signals to electrical output signals (col. 6, lines 5-29; col. 3, lines 35-36) obviously representative of the weight

bearing on the respective inflatable pockets. Havriluk does not disclose a stimulator that delivers stimulation to an area around the food in response to said electrical output signals. Rosenberg teaches a device that senses weight bearing applied to pressure sensors 2 and a stimulator ("discomfort-generator 3" col. 3, lines 8-21) that delivers stimulation in response to electrical signals converted from the pressure signals (col. 4, lines 19-30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Havriluk to incorporate an electrical stimulator as taught by Rosenberg in order to provide a more noticeable indication of weight bearing by the patient.

Allowable Subject Matter

51. Claim 7 is allowed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ERICA LEE whose telephone number is (571)270-1480. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30am-6pm, EST; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl H. Layno can be reached on (571)272-4949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ERICA LEE/
Examiner, Art Unit 3766

/Mark W Bockelman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3766